

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-1-2000

A study of board members' knowledge of IDEA and New Jersey's Special Education Code

Susan Lynne Geverd
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you -
share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

Geverd, Susan Lynne, "A study of board members' knowledge of IDEA and New Jersey's Special Education Code" (2000). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1677.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1677>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

A STUDY OF BOARD MEMBERS' KNOWLEDGE
OF IDEA AND NEW JERSEY'S SPECIAL EDUCATION CODE

By
Susan Lynne Geverd

A Thesis Project

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
Of
The Graduate School
At Rowan University
May 2000

Approved by: _____
Dr. Stanley Urban, Ph.D., Professor

Date Approved: May 1, 2000

ABSTRACT

Susan Lynne Geverd
A Study Of Board Members' Knowledge
Of IDEA And New Jersey's Special Education Code
May 2000
Dr. Stanley Urban, Ph.D, Professor
The Graduate School at Rowan University

The purpose of this study was to obtain information regarding the level of understanding that local school board members have in reference to IDEA and the New Jersey Special Education Code. A questionnaire was devised that contained twelve items in regards to least restrictive environment, free and appropriate education, the IEP process, evaluation procedures and parental rights. Thirty-six questionnaires were distributed to a convenience group composed of a school superintendent and board members. The sample represented four different counties in New Jersey. A total of 16 questionnaires were returned. It was found that out of the 16 respondents, 5 answered ten or more questions correctly. There were consistent weaknesses when referring to extended school year questions, as well as pertaining to parental written permission to conduct a Child Study Team evaluation.

MINI ABSTRACT

Susan Lynne Geverd
A Study Of Board Members' Knowledge
Of IDEA And New Jersey's Special Education Code
May 2000
Dr. Stanley Urban, Ph.D, Professor
The Graduate School at Rowan University

The purpose of this study was to obtain information regarding the level of understanding that local school board members have in reference to IDEA and the New Jersey Special Education Code. It was found that out of the 16 respondents, 5 answered ten or more questions correctly. There were consistent weaknesses when referring to extended school year questions, as well as questions pertaining to parental written permission to conduct a Child Study Team evaluation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to mom, dad, Kris, Steve and friends, who will never have to hear to word “Thesis” again. Thanks for all your support and tolerance through the trials and tribulations of this research.

Table of Contents

Chapter I	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Need for the Study	2
Value of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Definition of Terms	6
Limitations	6
Chapter II	7
Summary	11
Chapter III	12
Introduction	12
Population	12
Design of Survey Instrument	12
Method of Sample Selection	13
Collection of Data	14
Pilot Study	14
Research Design and Analysis of Data	15
Chapter IV	16
Results	16
Chapter V	20
Findings	20
Discussion	21
Appendix A	23
Appendix B	24
Bibliography	25

Chapter I

Introduction

Our democratic system of government structures constitute the core of our society. We strive to elect competent, knowledgeable individuals who are committed to excellence in all socially critical activities. This philosophy applies to local school board members who democratically elected officials that make decisions regarding our children's education. Board members make decisions regarding finances, staffing and distribution of school resources. In addition to these responsibilities, local school board members are responsible for educating all children within their tax district regardless of any pre-existing physical or mental disability.

There is no federal constitutional guarantee to education. However, when states determine they will provide an education at public expense, the fourteenth amendment guarantees "that states may not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Even though constitutional protections mandated equal protection of all children, including those with disabilities within a state's public schools, there was a great inconsistency across states. Therefore, Congress passed in 1975 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This statute was subsequently amended in 1990 and renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) which guarantees equal educational opportunities for children with disabilities.

Federal laws mandate that each state and de facto each local school board guarantees a "Free and Appropriate Public Education (IDEA, 1997) for all students.

These federal laws mandate that the local school district educate any and all children, including children with unlimited physical and/or mental disabilities. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) provides the parameters and principles for educating children with disabilities in a public school setting.

Local school boards are legally responsible to comply with IDEA. In order to achieve this, they must be proficient in interpreting and implementing the components of this law in their school district. Their duties of budgeting, staffing, and the implementation of school resources in relation to students with disabilities are all major components of IDEA.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine local school board members understanding of their responsibilities in implementing the 5 basic principles of IDEA when educating all disabled students who reside within their school district.

Need for the Study

Over the past few years, the number of school age students with disabilities served under IDEA has increased at a higher rate than general school enrollment. (US Department of Education, 1998) In the 1996/1997 school year there were 5,224,328 children, ages 6 – 21, served under IDEA in the 50 states, D.C. and Puerto Rico. (US Department of Education, 1998) In the same year, there were 185,635 children, ages 6 – 21 served under IDEA in New

Jersey. (US Department of Education, 1998) This number represents a significant amount of children that local school boards are responsible to properly educate. Based on this study, a survey will be formulated to measure the individual local school board member's knowledge of the basic six components of IDEA.

In reviewing the literature, there were no studies found that focused on local school board members and their knowledge of the IDEA. It is paramount to focus on this issue due to the vast increase of children with disabilities served under IDEA. In the 1987/1988 school year 4,110,690 children, ages 6 – 21, were served under IDEA in the United States and Puerto Rico. (US Department of Education, 1998) Nine years later in the 1996/1997 school year that number had increased by 1,113,638.

Most of the literature that addresses local boards of education and IDEA report that they need to “have a view to improving the delivery of service under PL 94-142 (St. Louis Post, 1993) (PL 94-142 subsequently has been revised to IDEA)

IDEA addresses issues ranging from transportation of disabled students to making structural accommodations within a school building. Due to the design of the democratic American school system, decisions regarding many of these issues must be approved by the local school board. This paradox of the perception of local control with the requirements of state and federal mandates creates a tension that manifests itself in many ways including litigation, controversy between school officials and advocacy groups and perceived best practices of professionals verses micro-management of special education

procedures contained in federal regulations. Therefore, the requirements of IDEA must be familiar to school board members in order for them to make sound, competent decisions, as well as to determine policy and allocate resources which allows them to comply with legal requirements.

There are many serious educational issues that board members must address. Because most members are serving in elected positions, there are no educational prerequisites that must be met to sit as a board member. This can potentially create a local school board that has little or no knowledge of how a school operates, or how to properly serve general education students let alone students with physical, mental disabilities and/or emotional disabilities. It is important to note that New Jersey failed federal monitoring of Special Education programs in February 1999. This suggests a need for a higher level of awareness at the local district level for the requirements of IDEA.

Value of the Study

The study will be a valuable source of information for the general public, school administrators and school board members. It will assess the knowledge of people who are elected to positions where they are responsible for implementing mandated public policy regulations. National and state educational organizations can use this information to determine whether or not school boards will need more training in regards to IDEA. This study will also serve as a tool for the public, enabling them to become advocates for enforcement of IDEA. In our democratic society of distributed responsibilities, this study

will report to the public the knowledge that school board members have of IDEA's basic requirements.

Research Questions

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, the data obtained will be used to answer the following questions:

Overall Question

1. What is the level of understanding of local school board members in regards to obligations/responsibilities of selected general requirements of IDEA?

Sub Questions

Do local school boards have a knowledge of the underlying principles of IDEA which are listed here:

1. Should all children with disabilities be given a free and appropriate public education?
2. What is involved in the Individual Education Plan (IEP) process?
3. What is the Least Restrictive Environment and should it be provided for every student?
4. What does the evaluation process entail?
5. What kind of procedural protections are guaranteed to parents?

Definition of Terms

To clarify and understand this study, the following list of terms and their definition as used in this paper:

The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act 1997 (IDEA) - originally

Public Law 94-142 is designed to ensure the following rights for students with disabilities:

- right to a free, appropriate public education
- right to non discriminatory testing, evaluation and placement procedures
- right to be educated in the least restrictive environment
- right to procedural due process of law

Local School Boards- a group of individuals who are usually elected and have responsibility to raise money through taxes, implement state and national statutes and regulations, as well as set goals and policies for their local school district.

Limitations

The sample of school board members selected for this study represents a non probability sample and may not be representative of the population of school board members in New Jersey. Also, it is possible that those who responded had a greater or lesser knowledge of IDEA than those who chose not to respond.

Chapter II

Review of Research

For many years just getting an education was no easy matter for children with disabilities. Many of these students were either educated in highly segregated programs and facilities or excluded from school entirely. (School Boards Association, 1992) Seasoned teachers and administrators report that in the 1950's and early 1960's, these children's classes were in the basement in a room the size of a closet near the boiler room. (Marge Heffner, September 30, 1999)

Change came slowly across the country in the 1960's and 1970's. Parents, legislators and educators led efforts to create appropriate educational programs for students with disabilities. Still, these early special education programs were often forced to be separate from the regular education programs. However, these programs would not be considered educationally sound in today's public school setting.

Children with severe and profound disabilities were in a separate category and often institutionalized. Several investigations during the early 1970's revealed that no meaningful treatment programs were provided in many of these institutions and unsanitary, abusive conditions often prevailed. (School Boards Association, 1992)

It was because of these circumstances and the heightened awareness of many abuses within the system that in 1975 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) was passed. PL 94-142 guaranteed that children would no longer be denied

a free appropriate education. PL 94-142 has since been updated and revised to provide additional protections for children with disabilities. This law has subsequently been revised and is now referred to as IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1997.

In order to fulfill the requirements of IDEA, qualified personnel must be a part of a local school district. The number of trained experts needed to educate just one special education student can be extraordinary. IDEA requires that the local school board assures the provision of related services: those components of an educational program which, while not primarily educational in nature, are deemed essential to enable disabled children to benefit from special education. (Farrow, Frank 1983) These related services include speech and language therapy, counseling services, transportation, and medical treatment if deemed necessary throughout the school day. It is apparent that special education programs need various trained specialists to comply with IDEA. The local school board needs to be knowledgeable about the requirements when they are making staffing, budgeting and policy decisions.

Policy decisions regarding special education must be consistent with IDEA to ensure that these decisions offer a free and appropriate education to all students. In 1988 the Supreme Court decided the most important expulsion case to date, *Hoing v. Doe*. This case is an example where the local school board needed to consult the requirements of PL 94-142. Two students with emotional disabilities were expelled by the San Francisco Unified School district for violent and disruptive behavior. The first student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP) identified him as "A socially and physically

awkward 17 year old who had experienced considerable difficulty controlling his impulses and anger.” He had always been teased and harassed. In response to this taunting, he choked another student and kicked out a school window. The local school board suspended him for 5 days and referred the matter to the appropriate committee recommending expulsion. At the end of the suspension, the local school board notified the student’s mother that it was commencing expulsion proceedings and that he could not return to school until a resolution was reached. The Supreme Court determined that the student’s behavior was connected to a manifestation of his disabilities. Therefore, the student’s expulsion would violate IDEA’s principle of zero reject. This term “zero reject” refers to offering every child, regardless of their disability, a free and appropriate education, rejecting no one. It was apparent that the emotionally disturbed student had a documented behavior disorder, which could not exclude him from receiving a public school education. These kinds of situations regarding policy occur every day at a local level. Local school boards must be aware of the requirements that IDEA holds in order to perform their duties as members.

In the past there have been some problems with local school boards and administrators understanding and interpretation with IDEA and PL 94-142. In the Washington Post in 1978, Sandra Boodman writes about PL 94-142 and the variance of compliance within districts of Virginia. At this point, there seemed to be no consistency of compliance. One county supervisor states, “It is time that the school board stopped rolling over and playing dead in the wake of state and federal laws.” (Boodman, 1978)

In addition, a policy study of 94-142 was conducted in 1981. This study sought to determine the knowledge of regular and special educators. The results indicated that general education administrators, who will be responsible for establishing the climate for reform and interpreting the policies of 94-142 in context of local schools, demonstrated the lowest level of consciousness of any of the groups listed. (Joiner, 1981) One of the leading duties an administrator performs is to guide and inform the local school board of policy, procedure and school activities. According to this study, at one point, general education administrators were having difficulties interpreting PL 94-142 themselves. No additional studies could be located which assessed school administrators' knowledge of IDEA. Also, no studies were found that assessed school board members' knowledge of IDEA.

Currently, the National School Board in a publication titled, Winners All, is calling for inclusive settings in all schools for all students. Regardless of their stance of Special Education, they suggest things such as requiring local school boards to identify students with disabilities by the type of service that they need, not by labels. (National School Boards Association, 1992) They also suggest that local school districts take full responsibility for educating all students. (National School Boards Association, 1992) The suggestions made by the National School Board assume that the requirements of IDEA would be implemented without the present legal and regulatory mandates. It seems they want this done without federal law, which is why they do not present a reasonable alternative to current procedures for determining eligibility. It is difficult to understand how a school board can properly educate every

student if they do not have a process for systematically evaluating students with special needs.

Summary

IDEA clearly indicates that no one should be rejected from the public school due to a disability. Local school boards are required to implement policies, which meet the IDEA requirements. In order to establish policy and allocate resources, local school boards must have a working knowledge of the basic principles of IDEA.

Chapter III

Design of the Study

Introduction

In this chapter, the population for the study is defined, the method used in selecting the sample from the population discussed, the instrumentation and procedures for collection of data are discussed and the procedures for analyzing the data are explained.

Population

The population selected for this study were members of local school boards located in Burlington, Gloucester, Camden and Salem counties.

Design of the Survey Instrument

An extensive review of the literature could not locate questionnaires that addressed the knowledge of board members knowledge regarding IDEA. An extensive search, including National School Boards Association literature and New Jersey School Board Association, revealed no such surveys. The questionnaire designed for this study was original and based upon New Jersey Special Education Administrative Code. A multiple-choice response was used. A total of 12 questions were presented, each having four multiple-choice possibilities. Each board member was required to circle their response. Several potential pitfalls had to be overcome in the design of the survey

instrument. First, the topic of regulations related to education of handicapped students is potentially a highly emotional, charged issue. Board members might alter their response to present socially desirable attitudes and portray themselves in a positive light. Second, wording of each item had to be free of bias in order not to promote reactivity and a response set in individuals answering the questionnaire. Third, close-ended questions with choices independent of each other were determined to be the format of choice. These multiple choice questions provided for economy time in responding, assured that the response would be clear and also assured full coverage of content.

Method of Sample Selection

Selection of the sample was accomplished in the manner described here:

Thirty-eight questionnaires were distributed in the following manner.

1. On January 25, 1999, a letter was mailed to one superintendent (Appendix A)

The purpose of this letter was to briefly explain the purpose of the study to ask for their help in distributing the questionnaire to members of the board of education. Ten questionnaires were sent to this superintendent and individual postage paid envelopes were included.
2. On January 24, 1999, seven questionnaires were sent to individual board member's homes. A letter accompanied the questionnaire that explained the purpose of the study and asked for their participation (Appendix A).

Individual postage paid envelopes were included.
3. On January 25, 1999, a packet of eleven questionnaires were given to a local

school board member and asked to distribute the questionnaires to their fellow members. A letter prefaced the questionnaire that explained the purpose of the study and asked for their participation (Appendix A).

4. On January 26, 1999, a packet of ten questionnaires was given to a local board president who agreed to distribute the questionnaires to his fellow members. A letter prefaced the questionnaire that explained the purpose of the study and asked for their participation (Appendix A). Individual postage paid envelopes were included.

Collection of Data

Three methods of distribution were used: The first method required superintendents to distribute the questionnaires to their local school board members, then the members used the addressed envelopes to return the survey. Using the second method, the surveys were directly sent to each individual board member's residence, then returned in an addressed envelope. The third method required two representatives of two different local boards of education to distribute the questionnaires to their fellow members. The members were then to individually fill out and send their responses, utilizing the envelopes with paid postage.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted with a group of 14 members of a community service organization. The members of this group consists of primarily of college graduates who

are retired professionals. The purpose of this procedure was to indicate necessary revisions in the questionnaire because of unclear questions or poor construction. As a result of the pilot study, several items were revised.

Research Design and Analysis of Data

Each individual questionnaire will be scored to determine correct and incorrect answers. Demographic data will be presented in tabular forms. Frequency of correct responses to each item will be reported and a summary of the correct and incorrect responses will be provided.

Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this study is to establish the level of understanding that local school board members in New Jersey have in regards to the basic requirements of IDEA. A questionnaire was sent to a school superintendent, a board member and a board president to distribute to the local school board members in their districts. An additional seven surveys were sent to individual board members' homes. A total of 38 questionnaires were distributed. The questionnaire measured their knowledge regarding free and appropriate education, IEP process, least restrictive environment, evaluation procedures and parental rights. Sixteen surveys were returned and represent four different local school districts in New Jersey. Table I shows the demographics data of the individual respondents.

As shown in Table I, 13 percent of the respondents had been board members for at least one year and eleven of the sixteen had attended college or graduate school. In addition, 11 percent of the respondents were employed in the field of education. The data pertaining the overall research question and the 5 sub questions is presented in the form of discussion and tables.

TABLE I
DEMOGRAPHICS
(N = 16)

Age	N	Sex	N	Years As A Board Member	N	Level Of Education	N	Full Time Employment In Education	N
30-40	3	Male	7	0-1	3	High School	3	Yes	5
41-55	9	Female	9	2-5	6	1-3 Years of		No	11
55 & up	4			6 & up	7	College	2		
						College			
						Graduate	5		
						Graduate			
						School	6		

Sub Question 1: Should all children with disabilities be given a free and appropriate education? As indicated in questions 1, 2, 7, 8 and 11, the most frequently missed question was number 8. The least frequently missed was number 1.

Sub question 2: What is involved in the Individual Education Plan (IEP) Process? As indicated in questions 3 and 4, this sub question represents the area that the board members have the highest level of awareness in.

Sub question 3: What is the Least Restrictive Environment and should it be provided for every student? Question number 5 indicates that the board members had a fairly good working knowledge of this area with 11 out of 16 participants answering the question correctly.

Sub question 4: What does the evaluation process entail? Results of questions 9 and 10 demonstrate that the board members had fairly good knowledge in regards to due process, but did not have a good knowledge background in the area of testing procedures.

Sub question 5: What kinds of procedural protections are guaranteed to parents?

The responses to questions 6 and 12 indicate that the board members have a very good idea about parental rights.

TABLE II
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO EACH CHOICE

Question Items	A	B	C	D
1. Free & Appropriate Education	12	2	0	2
2. Free & Appropriate Education	0	4	2	10
3. IE P Process	0	0	0	16
4. IEP Process	0	15	1	0
5. Least Restrictive Environment	0	1	11	4
6. Parental Rights	2	12	0	2
7. Free & Appropriate Education	2	2	10	2
8. Free & Appropriate Education	1	9	2	4
9. Evaluation Procedures	2	13	0	1
10. Evaluation Procedures	4	2	9	1
11. Free & Appropriate Education	0	5	0	11
12. Parental Rights	0	0	14	2

An examination of Table III shows that the most frequently missed items was number 8 with numbers 10, 5, 11, 7 and 2 being the next most frequently missed. Refer to Appendix B for a sample questionnaire with the correct answers indicated.

TABLE III
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Subject	Question Number	Number of Correct Responses Out of 16	Number of Errors Out of 16
Free & Appropriate Education	1	13	3
	2	11	5
	7	11	5
	8	6	10
	11	11	5
IEP Process	3	16	0
	4	15	1
Least Restrictive Environment	5	11	5
Evaluation Procedures	9	13	3
	10	9	7
Parental Rights	6	12	4
	12	14	2

Chapter V

The purpose of this study was to obtain information regarding the level of understanding that local school board members have in reference to IDEA and the New Jersey Special Education Code. A questionnaire was devised that contained twelve items in regards to least restrictive environment, free and appropriate education, the IEP process, evaluation procedures and parental rights. Thirty-six questionnaires were distributed to a convenience group composed of a school superintendent and board members. The sample represented four different counties in New Jersey. A total of 16 questionnaires were returned. It was found that out of the 16 respondents, five answered ten or more questions correctly. There was one respondent who answered all 12 questions correctly. There were consistent weaknesses when referring to extended school year questions, as well as questions pertaining to parental written permission to conduct a Child Study Team evaluation.

Findings

There was a 44.4% response rate among the board members. It is very difficult to get voluntarily responses from individual board members. This questionnaire posed some very specific school policy questions, which may have been threatening to board members and prevented them from responding. The responses were anonymous and not coded, therefore, follow-up letters could not be sent.

It is apparent that the participating school board members do not have a thorough understanding of the basic requirements of IDEA or The New Jersey Special Education Code.

Discussion

The local school district is mandated at the Federal Level, although school board members make most policies and decisions at the local level. It is imperative that these board members have a complete understanding of local, state and federal policies. If, in fact, these boards of education do not have a thorough understanding, very poor decisions may be made.

The field of education, specifically special education, is a very demanding, labor intensive field. Local board members need to understand IDEA and New Jersey Special Education Laws in order to comply with Federal mandates and run an effective and efficient school district. Staffing, budgeting and resources must be taken into consideration under IDEA and the New Jersey Special Education Code.

It is very difficult to have federal mandates implemented at the local level. When elected or appointed school board members are not thoroughly knowledgeable about school policies and procedures, it becomes even more difficult.

In order for these board members to become completely knowledgeable about IDEA and New Jersey Special Education Code, training procedures should be implemented. This should be a mandated component of assuming a board member position. An expert in the field of special education law should execute the training.

This training could be instrumental in improving the quality of educational decisions, as well as improve the overall educational model.

APPENDIX A

January 24, 2000

Dear School Board Members:

My name is Susan Geverd. I am currently completing a Masters Degree at Rowan University. I am surveying local school board members to fulfill my thesis requirement. My topic is on New Jersey school board members' awareness of special education laws. Your name, answers and district will remain anonymous. Your participation would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time!!

Sincerely,

Susan Geverd

January 25, 2000

Dear Superintendent:

This letter is a request for your cooperation to allow me to distribute a questionnaire to members of the board of education in your school district. The districts selected will be randomly drawn from Southern New Jersey. The questionnaire is a part of a study being conducted at Rowan University to determine board members' knowledge of local school districts obligations in educating students with disabilities.

Your assistance will primarily be in suggesting how I can go about distributing the questionnaire to your board members. Neither you, your school system, nor the respondents will be identified in any way in the final report of findings.

Your help in this matter is sincerely appreciated. I will be contacting you within a few days to determine how best to proceed.

Sincerely,

Susan Geverd
MA Candidate
LDT/C Program

APPENDIX B

General Directions

This survey is designed to measure the average board member's knowledge of local school districts responsibilities in educating children with disabilities.

You will not be associated in any way with your responses to the questionnaire. To assure a reliable questionnaire please observe the following procedures:

- 1. Do not confer with anyone when responding to the items.
- 2. Do not place your name anywhere on the questionnaire.
- 3. Do not ponder or research items, simply mark your first impression.
- 4. Please answer every question.
- 5. Please, if at all possible, return your completed questionnaire within three days.
- 6. Use the return envelope to return your completed questionnaire.

Please respond to the following:

AGE 30-40
41-55
55 and over

SEX M or F

YEARS AS BOARD MEMBER 0-1
2-5
6-Up

LEVEL OF EDUCATION ___ high school
___ 1-3 years of college
___ college graduate
___ graduate school

IS YOUR FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION? YES NO

In this questionnaire, the term "student with disabilities" refers to children who are determined by a Child Study Team as eligible for special education and related services and fall under one of the following categories as defined by the federal and state statutes:

Autism
Deaf-Blindness
Deafness
Hearing Impairment
Mental Retardation
Multiple Disabilities
Visually Impaired Including Blindness

Other Health Impairment
Emotional Disturbance
Specific Learning Disability
Speech/Language Impairment
Traumatic Brain Injury
Orthopedic Impairment

Please circle only one answer that best applies in your school district:

1. My district must provide full educational opportunities to....
 - A. Children identified as eligible for special education beginning at age 3 through age 21.
 - B. Special needs students until all their high school requirements are met.
 - C. Only children with disabilities between 3-21 who have the potential to be educated in the public school setting.
 - D. All children regardless of disability between the ages 3-21, if their parents request educational services.

2. In your district when a special education student brings weapons or guns to school....
 - A. Students can be suspended for up to 45 days without any schooling provided by the district
 - B. Students are automatically suspended for bringing in weapons or drugs regardless of their disability.
 - C. The local school board has the autonomy to decide what to do with special ed. students who bring weapons or drugs to school.
 - D. Students with disabilities can be suspended for up to 45 days but after the first 10 days of removal, the district must provide schooling beyond that point.

3. In my district a "transition plan" at age 14 for special education students....
 - A. Is a requirement but my district may opt out and decide not to provide this service.
 - B. Is not required by my school district as it goes beyond school boards responsibility as educators and would require excessive staff.
 - C. Is required only if a student is planning to attend vocational school.
 - D. It is mandated by Federal and State regulations that our Child Study Team with parent and student input must develop a transition plan.

4. Elements of each student's IEP may include related services such as speech, occupational therapy, physical therapy, counseling services and transportation services. In your district...
 - A. Students may be provided with these services as long as there is adequate personnel. If there is not adequate personnel, the needed service becomes the responsibility of the state.
 - B. Students with disabilities are provided with these services if the service is indicated on the IEP. My district will obtain any certified necessary personnel to provide these services.
 - C. Any student can receive these related services in my district providing there is a parent request.
 - D. Students can receive these services in my district only if they are eligible for special education at the pre school level.

5. In my district a LRE (least restrictive environment) means...
 - A. All students must be educated with children of similar ability or disability.
 - B. All special education students must be with regular education students for at least one of the following subjects, including art, music, PE or library.
 - C. Special education students to the maximum extent appropriate must be educated with children who are not handicapped.

- D. Special education students must be educated with children of similar ability or disability as long as physical limitations do not prevent this.
6. When a CST evaluates a child's eligibility for special education parents that disagree with their child's initial evaluation results or classification may...
- A. Transfer their child to another school/district at the expense of the current district as long as there is a program that both parents and school district can agree upon.
 - B. Parents may request a second opinion at the current school district's expense and then decide whether or not to accept these evaluations.
 - C. Opt to have a home schooling program for their child at the district's expense.
 - D. None of the above
7. In my district a free and appropriate public education is available to children with disabilities in their local school district, but if the parent chooses to place their child in a non-public school...
- A. The local school district is responsible to pay for their education.
 - B. If the child is eligible for special services, according to the public school, the public school is required to pay one-half the tuition cost at the private school.
 - C. The public school district must make special education and/or related services available to any child in a non-public school if parents request.
 - D. The services must be provided if the private school has opted to become a part of a stated funded network that provides these services.
8. In your district, what is necessary for a student with disabilities to have an extended school year? (i.e., 12 month program)
- A. Our district will provide an extended school year for any parent that requests it, at no cost to the parents.
 - B. In our school district, students who are eligible for special services may be considered for an extended school year.
 - C. In our district any child who shows documented regression may receive an extended school year.
 - D. All of the above.
9. In your district, if a student is referred to the Child Study Team for an evaluation and only speaks Turkish, an evaluation will be conducted under the following circumstances:
- A. Testing will be initiated when the child has learned to communicate with a Child Study Team member and can understand the test items in English.
 - B. A Turkish translator must be provided by the school district to interpret for the Child Study Team.
 - C. A Turkish translator must be provided only if the child is a citizen of the United States.
 - D. A Turkish translator will be provided regardless of citizenship and the parents and district will share the cost.
10. A parent must give written permission to conduct a Child Study Team evaluation. If the parents refuse to give permission:
- A. The district may not challenge this decision because of the primacy of parental rights.
 - B. The request to conduct an evaluation will be reviewed by an impartial panel convened by the county office of education.

- C. The district may initiate a due process hearing pursuant of New Jersey Special Education Code.
 - D. If the parent refuses, the parent must then find an alternative school placement at their own expense.
11. Students meeting the state and federal definitions of a student with disabilities do not need to be provided with a free education if...
- A. The state chooses not to comply with federal statutes since education is a state responsibility.
 - B. If it can be shown that the students can be served equally as well under other compensatory programs.
 - C. If the federal and state governments have not provided sufficient funds to cover the excess costs associated with special education.
 - D. None of the above.
12. In your district, if a parent disagrees with a Child Study Team determination that their child is not eligible for services as a child with a disability....
- A. The parent has no recourse and must accept the final decision made by the superintendent and Child Study Team.
 - B. The parent must go directly to court and engage in adversarial court procedures.
 - C. The parent may initially engage in mediation with an impartial hearing officer from the New Jersey Department of Education and consider the option of a due process hearing before an administrative law judge.
 - D. None of the above.

Thank you for you time and cooperation!
Please return in the self-addressed envelope as soon as possible!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boodman, Sandra G. (April 27, 1978). Handicapped Schooling In State: Progress is Varied. Washington Post.
- Editorial (October 13, 1993). School Failure. St. Louis Post.
- Farrow, Frank (1983). Effective Policies in the Provisions of Related Services, ED 245 468, ERIC, Council for Exceptional Children , 1920 Association Dr. Reston, Va.
- Individuals with Disabilities Act Amendments of 1997, P.L. No. 105-17, 105th Congress, 1st Session.
- Joiner, Lee M., Sabatino, David A. (1981). A Policy Study of Public Law 94-142. Exceptional Children, 48, 1, 1.
- Koenecke, William H. (1986). A Study of Public Law 94-142 as Viewed by Superintendents in Illinois, EA 018475, ERIC, Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, Va.
- Levine, Daniel and Omstein, Allan. Foundations of Education, 6th Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1997, pg. 173.
- National School Boards Association, (1992). Winners All: A Call for Inclusive Schools. Washington DC, Author.
- Personal Communication. Phone call to National School Boards Association, Washington, DC, September 27, 1999.
- Personal Interview. Marge Heffner, Salem, NJ, September 30, 1999.
- Special Education Administrative Code, chapter 14, New Jersey Administrative Code. Title 6A, July 6, 1998, amended November 2, 1998, New Jersey Division of Education, Trenton, NJ.
- U.S. Department of Education (1998). *To assure the free and appropriate public education of all children with disabilities: Twentieth Annual report to congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, DC: Author.